

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_127234
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES FACING THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL TOURISM IN TANZANIA:A Case Of Mto Wa Mbu - Monduli Counsel
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The objective of the article is to study cultural heritage or heritage tourism aspects. This is crucial to analyzing the economic values of culture and heritage. Therefore, the article is important to investigate heritage tourism development in this particular study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	My suggestion on optional titles: 1. Challenges in Developing Cultural Tourism in Tanzania: A Case Study of Mto Wa Mbu - Monduli Counsel 2. Challenges of Cultural Tourism Development in Tanzania: A Case Study of Mto Wa Mbu - Monduli Counsel	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The three lines stated in the abstract must be removed. The objective of the article must be clearly stated. It is not clearly stated. Moreover, the abstract's arrangement or organization is not correctly stated and must be reconstructed. Here, the key words are not short and precise. Finally, grammatical errors are there that need improvement.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is not appropriate. Specifically, the subtitle and the analysis between the introduction and methodology sections are not correctly positioned. These elements could be rearranged, removed, or considered as a review of related literature. The flow of the article structure should adhere to the following sequence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Introduction , ✓ Material and methods, ✓ Results & Discussion, ✓ Conclusions, ✓ Competing, Interests ✓ Acknowledgments Or in general it should be based on the journal guidelines.	

Review Form 3

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript requires substantial revisions. Specifically, the findings of the article, including results and discussion, have been presented and analysed separately and should be integrated for a comprehensive analysis. Furthermore, the study's findings are not articulated with sufficient clarity and breadth. The authors have not adequately presented the study's findings and objectives within the manuscript. The document consists of only three pages with two subtitles, offering limited analytical depth. This represents a significant deficiency.</p> <p>The challenges for tourism development should be articulated with precise and appropriate headings that align with the study's objectives. Additionally, the selection of titles for the analysis demonstrates limitations.</p> <p>The methodological part of the article is too poor.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The citation or reference is insufficient, particularly on the result and discussion parts of the document, which are almost without quotation or citation. For argument on the finding, citation, and reference must go beyond the author's arguments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>If the authors or the author improved all the comments given on the above, it might be sustainable.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Getenet Gedefew Fetene</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia</p>